

### REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated November 16, 2005. Claims 1-17 are pending and stand rejected. Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 6, and 11. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by these amendments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

#### Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 8, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,920,701 ("*Miller*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and the assertions and holdings therein.

Applicants respectfully submit that the *Miller* fails to teach, suggest, or disclose each and every limitation of the claimed invention. For example, independent Claim 1 recites, "distributing a message from an application server to one or more application layer routers through one or more first channels selected from a first channel layer, wherein the message is distributed to the one or more application layer routers in response to at least the one or more application layer routers registering with the application server to receive messages in accordance with configuration data of one or more endpoints." In particular, claim 1 recites, in part, "the one or more application layer routers registering with the application server to receive messages in accordance with configuration data." For the teaching of the application layer routers, the Examiner, prior to the amendment of claim 1, offered the routers 102 disclosed in *Miller*. Office Action, Page 2. Though, *Miller* merely teaches intermediary routers (e.g., 102, 302) that route message in accordance with the content of the data included in the message. Col. 3, Lines 60-65. While *Miller* does teach that the clients 304 may publish messages and that clients 306 may subscribe to messages, *Miller* fails to teach or suggest that the routers 302 subscribe with the publishers 304 to receive messages in accordance with configuration data. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent claims 1 and 11 and their dependents.

#### Section 103 Rejections

Claims 4-7, 9, 12, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miller* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,687,731 (“*Kaval*”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and the assertions and holdings therein. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and the assertions and holdings therein. As discussed above, independent Claims 1 and 11 are allowable over *Miller*. The Office Action fails to cite any teaching or suggestion in *Kavak* of the missing elements discussed above. Therefore, Claims 4-7, 9, 12, and 15-16 are allowable at least because they depend from one of allowable Claims 1 and 11. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all Claims.

If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

No fees are believed to be due. However, please apply any deficiencies or any other required fees or any credits to deposit account 05-0765, referencing the attorney docket number shown above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Feb. 16, 2006

Michael E. Cox

Michael E. Cox  
Reg. No. 47,505

**PTO Customer No. 26230**  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1717 Main Street  
Suite 5000  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Telephone: (214) 292-6107  
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091